Guidelines to improve internationalization in the psychological sciences

Puthillam, Arathy; Montilla Doble, Lysander James; Delos Santos, Junix Jerald I.; Elsherif, Mahmoud Medhat; Steltenpohl, Crystal N.; Moreau, David; Pownall, Madeleine; Silverstein, Priya; Anand-Vembar, Shaakya; Kapoor, Hansika

DOI:
10.1111/spc3.12847

Received: 26 February 2022 | Revised: 28 June 2023 | Accepted: 3 July 2023

DOI: 10.1111/spc3.12847

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

WILEY

Guidelines to improve internationalization in the psychological sciences

Arathy Puthillam[1,2] | Lysander James Montilla Doble[3] | Junix Jerald I. Delos Santos[4,5] | Mahmoud Medhat Elsherif[6] | Crystal N. Steltenpohl[7] | David Moreau[8,9] | Madeleine Pownall[10] | Priya Silverstein[11,12] | Shaakya Anand-Vembar[13] | Hansika Kapoor[1,14]

Correspondence
Arathy Puthillam, Rady School of Management, Univeristy of California San Diego, 9500 Gilman Dr, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA.
Email: aputhillam@ucsd.edu

Abstract

Conversations about the internationalization of psychological sciences have occurred over a few decades with very little progress. Previous work shows up to 95% of participants in the studies published in mainstream journals are from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic nations. Similarly, a large proportion of authors are based in North America. This imbalance is well-documented across a range of subfields in psychology, yet the specific steps and best practices to bridge publication and data gaps across world regions are still unclear. To address this issue, we conducted a hackathon at the Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science 2021 conference to develop guidelines to improve international representation of authors and participants, adapted for various stakeholders in the production of psychological knowledge. Based on this hackathon, we discuss specific guidelines and practices that funding bodies, academic institutions, professional academic

This commentary is based on the hackathon titled "Guidelines on Including Non-WEIRD Populations in Psychological Science" presented at the 2021 meeting of the Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science. This was also presented as a paper at the 60th Annual Conference of the Taiwan Psychological Association in October 2021.

societies, journal editors and reviewers, and researchers should engage with to ensure psychology is the scientific discipline of human behavior and cognition across the world. These recommendations will help us develop a more valid and fairer science of human sociality.

KEYWORDS
diversity, global south, internationalization of psychology, metascience, open scholarship, science

1 | INTRODUCTION

The majority of published studies in English in psychology are based on North American (Arnett, 2008) or Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD; Henrich et al., 2010) populations. Recent efforts like the Psychological Science Accelerator (Moshontz et al., 2018) are promising as starting points to eliminate overreliance on Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic (WEIRD) participants, yet there remains a long way to go to achieve equal representation among diverse groups of participants, authors, and editorial boards. Over 70% of samples employed in research published in *Psychological Science* during 2017 were from North America, Europe, and Australia (Rad et al., 2018); 60% of participants in studies from six psychology journals in the years between 2014 and 2018 were just from the US (Thalmayer et al., 2021). This disparity in the geographical representation of samples and researchers has been observed in many subfields of psychology, including cross-cultural psychology (Adair et al., 2002; Veillard, 2017), evolutionary psychology (Kurzban, 2013; Pollet & Saxton, 2019), experimental developmental psychology (Nielsen et al., 2017), and social psychology (Kurzban, 2013).

Further, US-based researchers are overrepresented in editorial positions in psychology and neuroscience journals (Palser et al., 2021). Similarly, across over 6000 journals, editorial boards are predominantly researchers who have affiliations to institutions in WEIRD countries (Altman & Cohen, 2021). Further, though the number of US-based authors have decreased slightly (to about 60% between 2014 and 2018 from over 70% in 2008; Arnett, 2008), the change is due to an increase in authors from English-speaking and Western European countries between 2014 and 2018 (Thalmayer et al., 2021), which accounts for 11% of the world population. However, 89% of the world population continues to be neglected.

2 | METHODOLOGY: HACKATHON

Against this background, we organized a 90-min hackathon virtually through Zoom at the Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science 2021 conference (SIPS, 2021). The overarching goal was to create and collate guidelines on, and standards for, evaluating and increasing internationalization in psychological research, aimed primarily at organizations housed in countries that typically fall under regions termed as "Global North," "WEIRD countries," "developed countries," "industrialized countries," and "countries with developed research systems." For brevity's sake, and because it is the term most people recognize, we will use the term Global North.[1]

SIPS hackathons are "hands-on projects with a clear end goal" (Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science, 2021). More specifically, hackathons are short organized sessions that allow scientific teams, including experts, researchers, and designers to collaborate more effectively in a brief, but intensive, session to attain the goal at hand (Parsons et al., 2022; Pe-Than & Herbsleb, 2019). Ideally, hackathons produce outputs that affect the methodology and theoretical rationale of how psychological science should be conducted (e.g., Baum et al., 2022).

TABLE 1 The countries of institutions of the participants of the hackathon.

Continent	Country	*n*
Australia		***n* = 2**
	Australia	1
	New Zealand	1
Europe		**12**
	England	1
	France	1
	Germany	1
	Ireland	2
	Italy	1
	Netherlands	2
	Scotland	1
	UK	3
Asia		**6**
	India	2
	Philippines	3
	Thailand	1
North America		**9**
	Mexico	1
	US	8
Total		**29**

Note: A total of 29 participants participated in the Hackathon over Zoom. This number includes the authors, including the facilitators. The bold values indicate the subtotal of researchers from each continent (i.e., Australia = 2, which consists of Australia = 1 + New Zealand = 1).

Here, we define diversity and inclusion in terms of internationalization, specifically with respect to researcher and sample diversity, and discuss possible changes stakeholders can make to improve validity, applicability, and generalizability of psychology across the globe. It is important to note that we do not delve into topics that are important for a truly representative social and personality psychology, such as rampant theoretical and methodological issues. For instance, we do not discuss the lack of bottom-up theories that investigate specific cultural phenomena or culturally sensitive measurement of phenomena, topics that are worth investigating and discussing in social psychology; we direct the reader to other papers that discuss these important topics (see, e.g., Atari et al., 2020; Saab et al., 2020; Uskul & Cross, 2019; Yarkoni, 2022). That is, our paper only focuses on specific and actionable guidelines for internationalization.

We have also identified specific key stakeholder groups for whom the guidelines will be useful: funding bodies, university administrators, professional organizations, researchers, journal editors and reviewers, and science journalists/communicators. Three of the authors, who were facilitators of the session, prepared a ramp-up video[2] describing the paucity of samples and authors from Global South populations in psychological and allied sciences. Including the facilitators, a total of 29 researchers at various career stages from 14 countries participated in the hackathon online through Zoom (Table 1).

During the session, participants were provided with a brief background about representation of samples and authors from Global South countries. Participants were then assigned to four breakout rooms focusing on different stakeholder groups: (1) authors, (2) journal editors and university administrators, (3) reviewers and science journalists, and (4) professional organizations and funding bodies. The facilitators cycled between the sessions to answer

questions and provide guidance. A working document was prepared and shared with the participants ahead of the session, where they were encouraged to note their names, institutional affiliations, contact information (optional), and their chosen breakout group. Those without a breakout group preference were allocated based on the number of participants in each room.

Each breakout group was presented with a table wherein they were to suggest guidelines, arguments for and against those guidelines, and references, if applicable. After the conference, the session facilitators provided participants with a summary of the guidelines and relevant arguments. Some participants then responded with helpful comments and feedback.

2.1 | Our positionality

The authors of this paper come from a variety of backgrounds and work across a diverse range of countries (see Table 1). Most of us (around 85%) are in the early stages of our careers: graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, researchers, and lecturers. Some of us are from privileged backgrounds (or able to pass as a majority member in our respective cultures), and/or have been able to study and work at more prestigious institutions, travel to other areas of the world, and/or engage in large-scale collaborations. Those of us with these privileges wish to use our privilege to advocate for a more inclusive science alongside collaborators without such privileges. We belong to a variety of community and professional organizations, including some of the ones mentioned in this paper.

Further, we believe that engaging meaningfully in scholarship means reconsidering "traditional" ways of doing science, meaning being open to methods outside of laboratory experiments (e.g., Grosz et al., 2020), being inclusive of the perspectives of researchers and practitioners outside of research-focused universities in the Global North, and recognizing that not all areas of the world have the same priorities when it comes to the definition of an academic. To us, global diversity, or internationalization, refers to not only representation across study participants, but also a leveling of power imbalances across researchers from different cultural, regional, and linguistic backgrounds; decolonized theories and methodologies (see Readsura Decolonial Editorial Collective, 2022a, 2022b; Segalo & Fine, 2020; Sundararajan et al., 2020); and communication and collaboration across relevant stakeholders across cultures.

3 | PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

We provide several recommendations based on the hackathon. By no means should all these recommendations be adopted at once: in the spirit of open scholarship, we want to encourage readers to approach these recommendations as a "buffet" (Bergmann, 2023), changing practices where and when they can. The recommendations are ordered by stakeholders; these stakeholders are presented roughly in the order in which an article is published in social psychology (e.g., we start with study conceptualization and end with publication and dissemination). Under each stakeholder section, we provide a range of recommendations to address how to engage in inclusive scholarship practices; these recommendations have been roughly ordered in terms of their difficulty, depending on the amount of effort the stakeholder might have to place to implement them. These are summarized in Supplementary Table S1.

We encourage starting with recommendations that require smaller change strategies, and working towards more challenging problems, which require institutional interventions. However, we acknowledge that institutions are not uniform; community leaders know their communities and institutions best and they should take and modify recommendations accordingly. To present these suggestions, we loosely follow the format provided by Kathawalla et al. (2021).

These recommendations were synthesized from what transpired in the hackathon and the comments in the summary document prepared by the session facilitators that was shared with the participants of the hackathon; these were subsequently amended by the authors for clarity and coherence.

3.1 | Funding research (stakeholders: Funding bodies)

Our first recommendation is that funding bodies be fair with authors and/or samples from the Global South. This is because the research infrastructure in the Global South is often not as mature as that in the Global North (e.g., Onie, 2020). This also means that due to limited resources, it may not be feasible to collect data from the Global South within the given time frame. Although the geographical and thematic scope of grants tend to be narrow, where appropriate, funders should require justification for inclusion of all research samples, not just those outside the Global North. Proposals intending to collect data outside the Global North should not be subjected to additional scrutiny over sample selection. However, applicants should be required to explain why they are working within the Global North in the same way explicit justification is required for working within the Global South.

Generally, granting bodies should also be mindful of the additional time it takes to coordinate and collect data from countries where research infrastructure is not as sophisticated as it often is in the Global North; therefore, they should not penalize researchers based on the proposed timeline presented in the grant. Additional time for grants involving representative populations from the Global South would ensure that research funding is more equitable across both the Global North and Global South.

Our next recommendation is that Global North researchers include, actively listen to, and learn from researchers from the Global South, possibly including their colleagues who might have lived experience in the Global South. To ensure adequate representation of scientists from across the world, funding bodies could incorporate an assessment of team diversity within their evaluation rubrics. For instance, funding bodies can weigh the number of geographic regions represented by collaborators on funding proposals during evaluation. An example of this would be the SIPS Grants-in-Aid program, which encourages and prefers to fund scholars who are underrepresented, defined by characteristics like career stage, geographic region, and funding availability (Urry, 2021).

Similarly, grant agencies must encourage or mandate partnership models when evaluating proposals intending to conduct research outside of the country of the funder and/or researcher. For instance, the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) offers schemes to promote international collaborations and networking grants for early career researchers (see UKRI, 2022). The US National Institute of Health (NIH) also facilitates partnerships across institutes across the world in the area of global health (see NIH, 2017). Encouraging partnership models such as these help in resource- and knowledge-sharing, especially when done in a reciprocal manner.

To ensure diversity at all levels, funding bodies should comprise a global advisory board for cross-country collaborations to evaluate collaborative proposals. Grant bodies that do not allow non-local PIs should be open to proposals that include an element of organization building, teaching, and/or community enhancement in other geographic regions. The third recommendation is to fund Global South researchers such that they can conduct research on topics that are of local interest, especially if it aligns with the funders' topics of interest. Usually, these can take the format of grants being provided to Global South researchers working in that region. These can range in topics and methodological and epistemic orientations; it should also include descriptive work about novel phenomena that have not yet been studied in mainstream social and personality psychology. It is possible that these initiatives already exist but are not discussed or publicized as often. An example of an already existing initiative to draw from and/or build upon is SPSSI's Researchers in the Global South Grants Program (see Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, n.d.).

However, we believe that there are a few limitations to this recommendation, especially if the professional societies are from the Global North. Specifically, most of the reviewers, who gatekeep these funds, would be from the Global Norths and are influenced by biases around Global South researchers, research priorities, or samples. Similarly, if Global North reviewers are not culturally aware of events in the Global South, they may not find the topics worth investigating. For instance, peer-review has been argued to be anti-innovation (Alberts et al., 2014; Gallo et al., 2021), as usually, reviewers prefer the "safer" options and disincentivize riskier choices. This is rooted in the fact that innovative proposals (including novel topics) may have less prior work; similarly, the proposers may not have a long track record, especially in attaining grants. Both of these factors (i.e., paucity of prior work along with a short track record) might make the reviewer think of the grant as riskier (Alberts et al., 2014; Gallo et al., 2021). To facilitate

grants for the Global South, grant applications should also be reviewed by people in the Global South, which can potentially circumvent biases and misunderstandings of those from the Global North.

Next, funders should potentially prioritize research programs by international authors through fellowships, and support exchange-based fellowships for graduate students and early career researchers (see Thalmayer et al., 2021). Similarly, visiting fellowships that prompt international mobility and contacts should be encouraged between researchers, professional societies, or universities. For instance, the NIH in the US provides a visiting fellowship for international fellows (see NIH, 2017). Similarly, the Leverhulme Trust provides fellowships to UK institutions to invite international professors (see Leverhulme Trust, n.d.).

In terms of implementation of grants, funding agencies should also allocate some money towards the communities that are being studied. This can include ensuring participant incentivization or other capacity-building activities. Further, funding bodies should incentivize participants across the globe at a similar rate, rather than allocate incentives based on the country of the participant. A further consideration is that participants should be provided with an incentive that reflects the wages of their country, such that it compensates for their opportunity cost. That is, whether they would be making more money participating in research studies than partaking in an equivalent activity. This surfaces another concern about whether participants across countries should be compensated at a similar rate or not. These are crucial issues that must be taken into consideration at the outset.

3.2 | Academic gatekeeping (university administrators)

As a first step for accountability, it is vital that department heads and university administrators have a written and visible mission statement that promotes the department's or university's stance and commitment towards diversity, equity, and inclusion. The meaning of diversity, equity, and inclusion for these institutions should be clearly defined. For instance, is a university able and willing to host international visiting scholars and/or sponsor a visa? An example of this would be the visiting doctoral research fellowship at Boston College which supports graduate students who have matriculated at one of their partnering universities to spend a summer at Boston College conducting research (see Boston College Office of Global Engagement, n.d.).

Organizations advocating for international collaborations should aim to recruit a global advisory board, including members who were born in and practice in a particular region, rather than those temporarily living/working in that region. Specifically, instead of celebrating scholars from the US, for example, visiting a village in India for a limited time as experts on India and offering positions on an advisory board, researchers who live in and study India should be given a higher priority to be members of the advisory board.

Department heads should partner with departments and laboratories outside of the Global North with access to diverse populations for diverse sample pools; these kinds of research relationships and partnerships can be institutionalized (Henrich et al., 2010). Aside from this, Global South researchers affiliated with Global North institutions can also be helpful in bridging this discrepancy. Their particular position can contribute to the internationalization of psychological sciences.

Moreover, department heads and university administrators should provide other forms of material support to Global South researchers, departments, laboratories, and universities. These should include, for example, equitable expectations of Global South students (Henrich et al., 2010) along with their Global North counterparts, funding for international collaborations, and open-access article processing charges. For instance, expectations in terms of timelines and funding could be adjusted for those who engage with Global South samples and researchers.

For instance, co-authors from higher-income countries can cover the cost of article processing charges, which is more of a burden for institutes and researchers from lower-income countries, considering the comparative resource availability. University administrators should also negotiate with journals to make articles open access, especially for Global South institutions and research articles with Global South samples. We recognize that with rapidly changing political climates in the Global North, which often includes decreased funding at both local and federal levels,

collaborative initiatives requiring significant funding is a challenge for the foreseeable future (Mitchell et al., 2019) and may require innovative solutions.

Department heads and university administrators should actively support students and faculty to work on improving sample diversity (Henrich et al., 2010), such as by funding and/or allocating a specific percentage of their budget to fund research with Global South samples or "big team science" research projects. This should also include mentorship or training modules in publication and collaborations, in partnership with universities in low and middle-income countries (LMICs; Begeny et al., 2018). Addressing these concerns would therefore allow the field to have a more nuanced understanding of social and personality psychology that will result in more responsive ways of addressing societal issues. Further, creating networks of collaborating universities across multiple countries, especially in the Global South is a possibility that needs to be explored at an administrative level. This could be done at the Global South level, wherein universities could create collaborative networks with other Global South countries. Universities/labs in the Global North that have a research focus on Global South countries could similarly facilitate south-south connections.

3.3 | Professional societies/organizations

We recommend that professional societies mandate a fixed percentage of the executive board from the Global South not only in terms of origin but also where those individuals are based. Societies should endeavor to create a network of diversity-related committees considering the multiple intersecting meanings of diversity, including geographical ones, as described here. These committees should have a vote on the executive board and be regularly consulted on organizational initiatives. This would allow more inclusive policies within organizations such that it serves the scientific community at large.

In addition, international members should be able to vote on matters so that change can be implemented at the organizational level. It is fundamental that professional societies partner up with local networks and communities, which would be beneficial to both groups. Local networks can be empowered by being provided low-cost to free access to well-funded and privileged societies, providing them knowledge to support their local communities better. Professional societies can partner up with local communities, as professional societies can benefit from the knowledge of local chapters who have the lived experience, knowledge, and context to understand the problems and issues faced by researchers in the area. This leads to more detailed understanding of the phenomena at hand, while empowering and championing local networks and communities. For instance, the European Society for Social Psychology (EASP) and the Society of Australasian Social Psychology (SASP) partner up to host a summer school biannually for SASP students. Similarly, EASP and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) host a summer school for North American PhD students. Such intensive courses could be hosted at regular intervals in collaboration with societies and organizations in the Global South.

Next, membership rates for professional societies should be adjusted based on the value of a country's currency and/or based on the World Bank classification of that country via an appropriate amendment to the organization's/society's by-laws. Alternatively, no-question waivers can be provided to interested researchers across countries. Some researchers may, for example, live in a richer country but have very little funding themselves, or may live in a poorer country but feel comfortable paying for professional membership. The European Association of Social Psychology allows members to choose their membership tier (including a waived one) with no questions asked (Steltenpohl et al., 2021), with minimal impact on membership fee income. Similarly, SPSP also has recently introduced a reduced rate for researchers from LMICs (see Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 2022). Additionally, societies should adopt transparency in membership fee waivers; that is, societies must elaborate the basis on which fee waivers are allocated and regularly publish statistics on waiver awards and rejections (that still protect the identities of those who have applied for waivers).

Scientific societies should ensure researchers (student and non-student) outside of the Global North are better represented via more diverse recruitment strategies (e.g., collaborating with local/national scientific societies).

Additionally, societies, especially Western scientific societies that have a goal of generalizing their science, should host conferences outside of the Global North at a regular frequency, such as every 2–3 years to improve accessibility (e.g., Steltenpohl et al., 2021). This also helps Global South researchers share their research without financial, legal, and other restrictions (e.g., time and money to obtain visas, immunizations, etc.) that many Global North countries enforce on Global South citizens. Alternatively, organizations can host hybrid conferences (with equal importance given to virtual and in-person components) to promote representation and accessibility across nations. This should include small grants provided to cover Internet costs on a needs-based case. This would allow scientists to hear about and engage with novel ideas from across the world, rather than just their circles. Organizations should also establish and promote funding opportunities available to Global South members. However, it is important to acknowledge that the in-person components of a hybrid conference might still be overrepresented by researchers in the Global North. It is more equitable to host conferences in countries where visa processes are easier for everyone (and not just for Global North researchers). For instance, SIPS 2024 is set to be held in Nairobi, Kenya (Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science, 2022).

Professional societies can support the internationalization of psychology through mentorship programs. This could include journal editors mentoring graduate students and other early career researchers towards publishing in psychology journals (e.g., Thalmayer et al., 2021) or towards reviewing and editing such journals. For example, *Personality and Social Psychology Review* is currently piloting an Editorial Fellowship position for psychologists from historically excluded groups. Similarly, *Personal Relationships* has a call for mentors for its international section, who would mentor international authors to encourage them to submit to the journal (Randall & Bryant, 2021). Other journals or societies should have editorial boards with members from Global South countries, including a subcommittee of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who will gain mentorship experience.

3.4 | Researchers: Study conceptualization and data collection

During the conceptualization stage, researchers should collaborate with those who are familiar with the nuances of a culture's or country's context at the study conceptualization phase (and not just at the data collection phase). When considering using minoritized or international participants, authors representative of those samples should be included at the design stage; for instance, one could collaborate with a researcher from Singapore at the design stage, such that they have a say in the design of the study keeping in mind the context and norms of Singapore. A study designed this way would lead to a more nuanced perspective, better translations, culture-specific understanding, and better theories (see Gervais, 2021). This is similar to participatory research, particularly that is conducted in neurodiversity research (Azevedo et al., 2022; Balcazar et al., 2004; Elsherif et al., 2022; Gourdon-Kanhukamwe et al., 2023; Manalili et al., 2022), in which neurotypical researchers ensure the neurodiverse community is directly included in research. Policy-making decisions that affect them and can be expressed by the commonly used slogan, 'Nothing about us without us.' Put simply, research conducted in the Global South actively needs to include the Global South; otherwise, we are not considering anything important or relevant to the community.

More coordinated attempts must be made to translate existing measures into local languages and in line with cultural differences (for example, through the Psychological Science Accelerator, Moshontz et al., 2018). However, here, we acknowledge the additional time, money, and resource burden for researchers, especially those from regions where English is not the dominant language.

Further, when methodologically appropriate, internet-based resources can be used to facilitate data collection from different samples. The ability to actively recruit a diverse sample like this, as well as the fact that online participants can participate from anywhere in the world, means that online samples may not be as dominated by Global North participants as lab-based studies. This does limit research to participants with Internet access, and so online data collection will not always be possible for all participants and all studies. However, data collection techniques should match the available resources in that region; for instance, Internet penetration is insufficient in many regions

and populations in the Global South, and therefore relying only on the Internet is not sufficient when attempting to draw a truly representative sample from those samples.

If feasible, it would be ideal for researchers to spend time learning about the cultures of communities they plan to study. This should be done in a culturally sensitive manner, involving reading texts in a wide variety of disciplines and subdisciplines from researchers who are experts about a particular topic in a particular culture/country. Researchers should design their studies such that they ensure that a representative sample can be included, based on logistics and resources. For instance, in lab experiments, some time periods, such as the afternoon or during festivals/holidays, are inconvenient for certain groups, which inadvertently excludes them. For example, conducting lab experiments on Fridays at noon excludes practicing Muslims (Aslan, 2019) who hold prayers at that time. As such, laboratory experiments should be conducted at multiple times and for a long enough period to allow for participation.

Secondly, researchers should not assume results or theories replicate across cultural or geographical contexts, instead replicating formative studies in different populations without perpetuating such assumptions. Further, researchers should consider the long-term consequences of their findings, and discuss whether the implications are likely to cause psychological and/or physical harm (causing or likely to cause harm) and/or are condemned as unethical. For example, the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT, 2022) released an apology for so-called "conversion therapies," which have harmed (and continue to harm) queer individuals across the globe. This specific apology also acknowledges their tacit role in propagating these kinds of harmful practices. At this point, it is important to note that these same rhetorics and "scientific" arguments are used not only in the countries where the science is conducted, but also in other countries. For instance, pathologizing of queer identity continues within mental health professionals (see, e.g., Kottai, 2022), using the rhetoric or narratives used by the APA. For other examples and an argument for how increased diversity can help avoid potential harm in psychological research, see Conry-Murray and Silverstein (2022). Further, existing biases should also be considered (see Sharpe et al., 2021). For instance, if a study focuses on ethnic or religious minorities, specific consideration should be given to the assumptions and findings such that existing biases are not reinforced. Given that all research sustains values (Steltenpohl, 2020), and that values differ across geographic regions and cultures, researchers should consider engaging in reflexivity and adding a positionality statement to their manuscripts (discussed in further detail later).

3.5 | Researchers: Data reporting and analysis stages

Authors should report sample characteristics in as much detail as possible (see Sabik et al., 2021). They must additionally justify samples that are from a single population (especially if from an overrepresented region), and how a cross-cultural sample should be used to study more than one culture. These should be noted and detailed in their manuscript. In this way, a more complex and nuanced understanding of generalizability of behavior can be assessed, compared to an assumption of generalizability or universality.

Abstracts need to report a more detailed description of the sample. While this may take up additional word count, this should instead be reported separately from the abstract. For example, this can be presented in a manner similar to how "research highlights" are presented (a few bullet points summarizing the main findings of the study, e.g., see the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*).

Rad et al. (2018) suggest that research should be conducted on "the lay beliefs that psychological scientists use to justify their continued unreflective reliance on WEIRD samples" (p. 11403) as this issue has been given a lot less attention than the issue of underpowered studies, for example. Therefore, they argue that authors should justify their study populations in the same way as authors are encouraged to justify their sample sizes. Authors should accordingly include a section on sample justification regardless of the samples used. Currently, this is usually only requested for Global South samples, but should also be included for Global North samples. Some journals already specifically require this through a sociocultural policy, (e.g. see Society for Research on Child Development, 2020), but authors submitting to journals that do not can choose to adopt this guidance wherever they are submitting. Further, authors

must discuss why a more diverse population was not sampled (if that is the case). This would frame cultural differences in a more nuanced manner, and would allow the reader to assess biases. This should also encourage collaboration by allowing less leeway for using convenience samples without an effort to diversify samples.

Here, it is important to note that the request for Global North samples is a reflection of the experience of the authors and the hackathon participants, as our positionality statement notes. Previous studies have shown that scholarly publications (e.g., books and journal articles) from the Global South often include explicit references to their geographical origin in their titles (see Baber, 2003; Castro Torres & Alburez-Gutierrez, 2022). Similarly, scholarship in the Global North tends to reproduce the privileges of their geographic regions in their writing styles, by for instance, writing the paper as generalizable, whereas those in the Global South may use geographic markers such as "in India" (Ergin & Alkan, 2019). However, though the evidence for this general point has been reiterated in informal networks and social media, the cause for this can be extremely difficult to empirically show (but see Harris et al., 2017). That is, one might argue how does one determine if the request for Global North samples is because of racial bias or because most theoretical accounts in social and personality psychology come based on tests of participants from the Global North? Determining this is beyond the scope of this paper, but it points to a more crucial point- why do we not have focal theories about behaviors in the Global South? This is perhaps a chicken-and-egg problem: to have theories about the Global South, we need infrastructure, researchers, and samples from the Global South (the focus of this manuscript), and to have justifiable infrastructure, researchers, and samples from the Global South, we need theories about the Global South.

Although as a field, we aim to investigate the universal correlates of behavioral and cognitive constructs, we only require justification when including the Global South samples, but never exclusively the Global North samples. As a result, our understanding of specific behaviors and cognitive states are limited to what is assumed to be from a supposed representation of behavior that is not universal in nature (e.g. Henrich et al., 2010).

Our next guideline is that authors should thoughtfully evaluate within their manuscripts how findings are generalizable across populations, beyond general statements that "results may differ in other regions, so more research is needed," with a citation for the Henrich et al. (2010) paper or others following that (e.g., Adair et al., 2002; Kurzban, 2013; Nielsen et al., 2017; Pollet & Saxton, 2019; Puthillam, 2023; Rad et al., 2018; Veillard, 2017). This blanket statement does not provide precise and clear hypotheses and does not enable culture-specific findings to be distinguished from universal results. As a result, findings are argued, even if implicitly, to be universal without further empirical verification. Therefore, authors should explicitly tie findings to the specific populations from which they sampled. On the other hand, authors from particular, especially majority/overrepresented cultures are unlikely to know about other, often minoritized cultures. As a result, it is necessary to extend our knowledge from research published in Anglocentric cultures and English to languages and cultures that are not Anglocentric in nature. Alternatively, if this is not possible, we would need to include a Constraints on Generality Statement (Simons et al., 2017), detailing what we expect to observe in cultures not similar to the Global North (see Hajdu et al., 2022; Terry et al., 2023).

Authors must set aside a proportion of their research projects (in terms of time, money, and resources) to Big Team Science projects and international collaborations across multiple countries. Examples of this are plenty in psychology, including social psychology (see Bago et al., 2022; Klein et al., 2018; Moshontz et al., 2018; Pownall et al., 2021, 2023, van Bavel et al., 2022), cognitive psychology (Chen et al., 2023), linguistics (Coretta et al., 2022) and economics (Delios et al., 2022; Tierney et al., 2020, 2021). Although such studies are very time- and resource-intensive, depending on the study characteristics and the role of the author, this is one benefit to ensure that our findings are universal and generalizable.

Finally, we should not limit any discussion of generality and universality to only the methods section. It should be extended to all the sections of the manuscript. This way we can provide a less biased narrative that the effects we are observing are universal when in fact it may be universal or region-specific. In the Abstract section, we can detail information concerning the sample and the justification of sample demographics. For example, if students were recruited from different ethnic backgrounds, countries, and geographical regions, including those from the Global North, we can note these characteristics. Although this may lead to an increase in word count in the abstract, the

information placed in this section would aid researchers to further evaluate the studies in terms of its generalizability or universality (or lack thereof) at the get go.

3.6 | Journals editors/reviewers

Journal editors should actively discourage reviewer comments suggesting papers "be read/edited by native readers" (see for example, Measey, 2017; Romero-Olivares, 2019). Instead, a fairer presentation could be to "carefully proof-read or copyedit" the manuscript, without making assumptions about the language proficiency of the authors. Editors and reviewers could also ensure that the implications of findings are not prejudiced/biased especially towards minoritized social groups (broadly defined), at least in terms of reporting. This could be done by asking authors to revise parts of the manuscript that reinforce biases towards marginalized or historically excluded populations.

Further, Global North samples should not be inherently considered the norm. To this end, journal editors could refrain from asking authors to compare a sample from a Global North country to those in Global South countries. That is, as studies in the Global North are not often asked to be replicated in the Global South for generalizability, journal editors should not ask authors to replicate the study in Global North countries to ensure generalizability. Asking authors to justify their samples from Global South in terms of generalizability should similarly highlight biases about what is considered the norm. Thus, journal editors should be cognizant of such comments, and should screen any reviewer comments that suggest this.

Journal editorial boards could include more Global South authors, who are able to bring in specific cultural contexts (Arnett, 2008). This could be done through special issues as well, wherein Global South authors are invited to be guest editors, reviewers, and authors. Thalmayer et al. (2021) reported that though the Society for Research on Child Development had conducted early efforts towards internationalization, the 2018 issues of the journal *Child Development* did not have especially higher numbers of Global South authors. The authors suggest "efforts will need to be ongoing and at multiple institutional levels to succeed in making long-term impacts" (p. 125).

In academic publishing, one of the biggest benefits of the Registered Report format (Chambers & Tzavella, 2021; Nosek & Lakens, 2014) is that reviewers and editors have the ability to make suggestions that actually can be implemented in the study design. This is in stark contrast to "traditional" publishing, whereby any issues with sample diversity cannot be fixed and so the only option is to be as transparent about these shortcomings. Therefore, when reviewing Registered Reports, reviewers and editors should encourage broader and more representative samples from across countries for the proposed studies (when appropriate). However, although Registered Reports have this benefit of being able to input on study design, it is also important to consider any resource constraints of authors submitting these Registered Reports (especially from LMICs), and to take these constraints into account when making suggestions. For example, authors may have a sampling plan that is resource-based rather than from a power analysis (e.g., they have funding to collect data from 50 participants), and reviewers and editors will need to consider whether they think the sample size will still contribute meaningfully to the literature even if it may not be large enough according to a power analysis. Note, similar considerations can be made for traditional manuscripts too—if authors have made clear that they have resource constraints then it would be advisable to not suggest that they conduct another study, and instead review the study as it has already been conducted.

Further, international reviewers should be invited to review both papers from the Global North and Global South. This can be done by having an "open call for reviewers" with a sign-up form on the journal's landing page (e.g., see the *Journal of Open Source Software*). This ensures that information presented in manuscripts that expect the readers to know country-specific information is clarified further. Considering that Global South authors are expected to spend space in their manuscripts describing country-specific context, this should also be expected of Global North authors to promote equity and better understanding of the manuscript's arguments and findings.

Another recommendation is that journal editors invite underrepresented authors to submit papers. This could be done by prioritizing Global South samples or authors. Diversity targets, based on the average number of scientists

in research and development in different countries (e.g., using The World Bank indicator) should be attempted. This could be done through devoting specific pages of the journal or through special issues (Begeny et al., 2018). In case of special issues, the guest editor should have research experience in underrepresented countries.

3.7 | Meta-data and other journal-specific guidelines

Researchers could be encouraged to include a researcher positionality statement, which acknowledges the role of the researcher and other contexts in the research study. This could include information such as their pedagogical background, religion, class, gender, nationality, country of origin, and neurodiversity, among others. This provides a more well-informed and robust perspective for the reader. While this is not a norm in quantitative research, there are guides to help quantitative researchers engage in reflexivity (Jamieson et al., 2022; Steltenpohl, 2020). It is important to note a few things about positionality statements, namely that they are not the same as conflict-of-interest statements, they are not a credentialing process (i.e., they do not give or take away "permission" to do research), and are not meant to be used as justification for accepting or rejecting a manuscript. Journal editors may develop policies within masked reviewing systems that allow for masking of potentially identifying information in positionality statements.

We recommend that journals request that authors include positionality statements, sample diversity statements, and community impact statements within submitted manuscripts, as relevant to the journal goals. Additionally, journal editors could examine word count requirements, as many of our suggestions (sample justification, positionality statements, etc.) may increase the length of a manuscript. For example, a journal may opt to not include sample justification and positionality statements into any word count restrictions.

Regarding sample justification, journals should consider which "stringency level" to adopt, similar to the Center for Open Science's TOP Guidelines (Nosek et al., 2015). Each of the eight TOP domains are subject to three graded levels of adoption (Disclose, Require, and Verify). Using this format, journals would need to decide whether they want only to encourage authors to *disclose* their sample justification (i.e., the answer to this disclosure has no impact on publication), or whether they want to *require* that authors have paid attention to sample diversity where this is possible and appropriate. However, the criteria for deciding whether a justification is acceptable is not clear-cut. For instance, would it be enough for authors to say that they did not have the resources to collect data from the Global South? This is similar to considerations journals have to make about data sharing: they need to come up with rules about which conditions make authors exempt from sharing their data (e.g., if the data are identifiable). So, these are difficult decisions to make, but not necessarily more difficult than many other policy, procedure, and practice decisions that journals need to make on a wide variety of issues.

Van de Vijver (2013) discusses how there are strong expectations of editors and reviewers regarding what should be included in manuscripts and where or what statistical techniques are appropriate; if the information presented does not conform to these implicit norms, the authors may be misconstrued as incompetent. For instance, there is an implicit norm of conducting laboratory experiments (but not necessarily field studies) in social psychology and accepting that lab experiments are the best way to determine causation (Grosz et al., 2020), whereas in another field, regression discontinuity designs (e.g., Soland et al., 2022) might be acceptable. Similarly, though statistical mediation analyses (Rucker et al., 2011) were popular in experimental social psychology a few years ago, they fell out of favor in recent years. Analysis of Variance was popular in experimental cognitive psychology a few years ago, in recent years general linear mixed modeling (Winter 2019) is more popular.[3] Any researcher who is not well-versed in these implicit, and sometimes, time-based norms could be at a disadvantage when trying to publish in field-specific journals. Journal editors and reviewers should pay attention to such papers, especially when the authors are from, or sample from underrepresented countries or cultures, and consider them on their scientific merit.

One possible low-cost intervention for increasing Global South samples and authors could be through badges (e.g., see these "Badges to Acknowledge Open Practices"; Blohowiak et al., 2013; also see Baker, 2022). Various

badges could be included for samples, authors, and citations. There is some preliminary evidence that implementing badges is associated with an increased rate of the respective practice (Kidwell et al., 2016, but see Bastian, 2017). It is possible that badges could, however, encourage superficial engagement with diversity, rather than deeper consideration. This is mirrored in findings regarding the "open data" badge—even when data and code are shared, analyses are not necessarily reproducible (Kingi et al., 2018). Therefore, any new badges should be adopted with caution and careful consideration of what the bar would be for assignment of the badge.

Next, it has been found that there is a racial citation gap (Chakravartty et al., 2018; Kozlowski et al., 2022). We recommend that journal editors and/or reviewers suggest additional citations to papers using Global South samples/written by Global South authors that would encourage a more holistic understanding of the topic. Tools have been developed (e.g., see The race/ethnicity Citation Audit Template) that have the potential to be adapted to audit geographical citation diversity.

Existing diversity could be described and possibly analyzed at the author, sample, reviewer, and editor levels. For example, author and sample demographics of papers submitted, desk rejected, and reviewed should be made openly available at the journal level, on a yearly or half-yearly basis. An example of this is a recent request for proposals by SPSSI on investigating disparities across SPSSI journals by race/ethnicity and gender across "editorial teams, reviewers, published articles and rejected articles (as far as available information allows)" (page 1 of SPSSI's request for proposals).

An existing framework for this is provided by Buchanan et al. (2021), who proposed a Diversity Accountability Index for Journals for psychological science; however, this is specific to country-level diversity, rather than international diversity, and therefore, can be adapted. Similarly, *Personal Relationships* created a "diversity matrix" for its editorial staff (Randall & Bryant, 2021). Similar exercises could be conducted by journal editorial boards and professional societies, wherein authors, reviewers, editors, and other stakeholders can self-identify in terms of their identity.

Author Processing Charges could be automatically waived for authors submitting from institutions situated in LMICs; such options should be publicized widely. Often institutions from LMICs do not have the financial support required for APCs, and therefore, are a burden to the authors and/or their institutions, as discussed earlier. Similarly, at the access stage, studies using Global South samples could be available open access. Open access articles are often cited more than those within paywalls (Harnad & Brody, 2004; Kousha & Abdoli, 2010; Wang et al., 2015).

Relatedly, abstracts should be translated to as many different languages as possible for better access. This can be done through a consortium of volunteers or by individual journals. However, this may serve as an additional and/or disproportionate burden on bilingual or multilingual authors.

For expansion on many of these and further suggestions for how journal editors can improve internationalization at their journals, see the section on "diversifying your journal" in Silverstein et al. (2023).

3.8 | Dissemination (science journalists/science communicators)

Although most research concludes when a traditional journal article (or other academic output) is published, some research is elevated to capture the attention of broader audiences. Those in science communication have a vital role to play in disseminating scientific findings among the general public.

Therefore, science journalists and communicators are recommended to make explicit the composition or demographics of the study sample being reported. They should ask authors, should this information not be readily available or in the paper itself.

Science journalists should be careful about claims of generalizability and replicability based on the diversity of the study sample. When writing, they should exercise nuance and provide enough context about such claims.

Science journalists should further audit and be mindful of the proportion of Global North to Global South samples in their own editorials and articles. They could expand their own networks and be proactive in featuring people outside of Global North countries or demographics and studies with Global South samples. For instance,

learning and implementing best practices when reporting science and health stories (Science Media Centre, 2009) could improve representation of studies and authors reported in the popular press. Other methods include looking for diverse sources for scientific stories, such as making an effort to interview underrepresented scientists from diverse nations (see for example, Diverse Expert Databases from the Newmark J-School Research Center, n.d.). An example of this could be lists or websites such as 500 women scientists or Women in Probability, which can also be cross-posted on society websites.

4 | LIMITATIONS

Though this manuscript attempted to provide recommendations to improve internationalization in psychology, there are a few caveats that should be mentioned.

The most obvious of these is the nature of how these recommendations came about. As this manuscript originated as a hackathon, it is a product of the people who attended and contributed to the session. Our positionality statement goes some way to describing who we are, and therefore our perspectives, but it is worth reiterating that the recommendations we have come up with are a product of our own knowledge and experiences. For this reason, this guide is not to be thought of as authoritative, exhaustive, or prescriptive, and instead, it is just a collection of recommendations for advancing global social psychology.

Further, though a few of the authors have experience with this, we do not discuss in detail about social psychologists in Global North institutions who have lived and/or professional experience in the Global South (e.g., through some form of schooling/education); their positionality and experience could provide with important contexts for internationalization goals.

Next, is to be noted that the current manuscript only sheds light on internationalization of psychology, and not within-country disparities with respect to diversity. For example, racial and economic disparity in countries such as the US has not been discussed here; similarly, relevant to other countries such as India, discussions about religious and caste-based diversity has not been attempted. Such diversity of constructs, samples, and researchers is vital for us to have a generalizable science of human behavior; however, this was not the focus of the manuscript. Additionally, we do not discuss the larger systemic barriers to internationalizing psychology. For example, the incentive structures and logistics of how science is conducted at large are not discussed here; therefore, not all researchers individually (or as representatives of institutions) will be able to incorporate these changes. Not holding individuals and institutions accountable for the implementation of these recommendations and questioning them if and when they cannot implement some of the recommendations is important. It is equally important to realize and acknowledge that the state of social and personality psychology is reflective of the current state of the social world, which does prioritize the interests of certain races, countries, genders, and other social and economic groups. This includes the presence of English as the scientific lingua franca (Blasi et al., 2022; Draguns, 2001).

However, we believe that science in general is a group endeavor and here, we were able to discuss some possible changes for the short-to-medium term. Further, individual scientists in positions of power and those with resources (time, money, networks, and funding) are particularly encouraged to take these suggestions into account while designing their studies. Similarly, those with the resources and power to implement change at the systemic level (e.g., executive boards of scientific societies or the editorial boards of journals) are also encouraged to take these suggestions into consideration when making decisions.

5 | CONCLUSION

Social science requires a diversity of lived experiences in order to generate new ideas. This is especially true of social and personality psychology, where we study how social contexts shape our behaviors. The present commentary

provides an overview to aid researchers, journal editors and reviewers, professional academic societies, funding bodies, universities, and science communicators to enable an increase in representation of the oft-neglected Global South in social and personality psychology. We recommend that these groups actively engage in efforts to improve the internationalization of psychological science and develop concrete recommendations to accomplish this goal. In turn, the benefits of greater global diversity in psychology would aid not only the Global South, but the scientific community as a whole.

Social and personality psychology examines dispositional and social behaviors by noting how people behave within personal, sociocultural, and historical contexts. Our social lives are traditionally investigated in a culture-blind manner (Berry, 2013) with a myopic lens. Specifically, psychological constructs are investigated largely by researchers in the Global North among a sample from the Global North. Therefore, the ways in which these constructs operate or emerge in other contexts, such as the Global South, has been conventionally ignored.

Allowing Global South researchers to engage equitably in social and personality psychology (e.g., by citing them or easing barriers to accessing academic opportunities such as attending conferences) would form a useful foundation to examine the effects of such systemic changes (e.g. Power & Velez, 2020, 2022). By including researchers from the Global South, we can assess the role of psychological phenomena using important sociocultural contextual cues to form generalizable/specific theories, and investigate otherwise unexplored constructs.

In addition, we document the possible barriers for conducting such an exercise. As social psychologists, we try to formulate theories about our social worlds; but whose worlds deserve theories? By including researchers from the Global South, we can advance ethical, epistemological, ontological, and methodological insights that then empower social and personality psychologists to understand specific dispositional and social phenomena that are region-specific and universal. These allow us to provide better support and create a more just society. To end, this commentary can be one step towards a "huge opportunity to not only advance our science but also equitably serve all of humanity" (Ghai, 2021, p. 2).

AFFILIATIONS

[1]Department of Psychology, Monk Prayogshala, Mumbai, India
[2]Rady School of Management, University of California, San Diego, California, USA
[3]University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines
[4]School of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts, University of Baguio, Baguio City, Philippines
[5]Department of Psychology, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, Philippines
[6]Department of Psychology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
[7]Dartmouth Center for Program Design and Evaluation, Lebanon, New Hampshire, USA
[8]School of Psychology, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
[9]Centre for Brain Research, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
[10]School of Psychology, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
[11]Psychology Department, Ashland University, Ashland, Ohio, USA
[12]Institute for Globally Distributed Open Research and Education, Gothenburg, Sweden
[13]Department of Psychiatry, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
[14]Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut, USA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge the contributions of the participants of the hackathon. Specifically, we thank Lena Ackerman, Myriam A. Baum, Marica Cassarino, William Chopik, Clare Conry-Murray, Michelle Ellefson, Sophie Gerdel, Jennifer Gutsell, Hans (Rocha) IJzerman, Caroline Leygue, Esther Maassen, Harry Manley, Effie Marathia, Sandersan Onie, Paul Plonski, Monica Renee Policarpio, Jennifer Taber, Laura Thomas-Walters, and Alex Uzdavines for their inputs during the conference.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

ORCID

Arathy Puthillam https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2426-8362
Lysander James Montilla Doble https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7414-8484
Junix Jerald I. Delos Santos https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0452-3987
Mahmoud Medhat Elsherif https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0540-3998
Crystal N. Steltenpohl https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5049-9354
David Moreau https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1957-1941
Madeleine Pownall https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3734-8006
Shaakya Anand-Vembar https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9315-1865
Hansika Kapoor https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0805-7752

ENDNOTES

[1] At this point, we acknowledge that questions and conversations about internationalization and diversity are difficult. In this manuscript, we often use proxies; however, these proxies are helpful to stimulate discussion on these issues.

[2] The working document from this session, along with the ramp-up video, slides, and transcripts, along with a link to the working document, are included in the Supplementary Materials as well as on OSF (osf.io/vm3sd).

[3] Note here that we are not making a case for or against certain statistical methods, just describing the waxing and waning popularity of methods in subfields (and we are certainly not making a point about why or how or even who is responsible).

REFERENCES

Adair, J. G., Coêlho, A. E., & Luna, J. R. (2002). How international is psychology? *International Journal of Psychology*, *37*(3), 160–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590143000351

Alberts, B., Kirschner, M. W., Tilghman, S., & Varmus, H. (2014). Rescuing US biomedical research from its systemic flaws. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *111*(16), 5773–5777. https://doi.org/10.1073/2Fpnas.1404402111

Altman, M., & Cohen, P. N. (2021). Openness and diversity in journal editorial boards. *PsyArxiv*. https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/4nq97

Anon. (2020). *New sociocultural policy enacted across all SRCD journals society for research in Child development SRCD*. (n.d.). Society for Research in Child Development. Retrieved from https://www.srcd.org/news/new-sociocultural-policy-enacted-across-all-srcd-journals

Anon *SIBL citation audit template*. (n.d.). The Stereotypes, Identity, and Belonging Lab. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HHM6i1WDaAVzSJxgZG8UtNWP3aRcFprsdVpLZJEWxOQ/edit#gid=759055580

Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%, a challenge to psychology's philosophy of science. *American Psychologist*, *64*(6), 571–574. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016723

Aslan, R. S. (2019). *What is the significance of Friday prayers in Islam?* The Conversation. Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/what-is-the-significance-of-friday-prayers-in-islam-113702

Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies. (2022). ABCT apology for behavior therapy's contribution to the development and practice of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression change efforts. Retrieved from https://www.abct.org/latest-news/abct-apology-for-behavior-therapys-contribution-to-the-development-and-practice-of-sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity-and-expression-change-efforts-history-and-next-steps/

Atari, M., Graham, J., & Dehghani, M. (2020). Foundations of morality in Iran. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *41*(5), 367–384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.07.014

Azevedo, F., Middleton, S., Phan, J. M., Kapp, S., Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, A., Iley, B., Elsherif, M. M., & Shaw, J. J. (2022). Navigating academia as neurodivergent researchers: Promoting neurodiversity within open scholarship. *APS Observer*, *35*.

Baber, Z. (2003). Provincial universalism: The landscape of knowledge production in an era of globalization. *Current Sociology*, *51*(6), 615–623. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516004

Bago, B., Kovacs, M., Protzko, J., Nagy, T., Kekecs, Z., Palfi, B., Adamkovic, M., Adamus, S., Albalooshi, S., Albayrak-Aydemir, N., Alfian, I. N., Alper, S., Alvarez-Solas, S., Alves, S. G., Amaya, S., Andresen, P. K., Anjum, G., Ansari, D., Arriaga, P., & Aczel, B. (2022). Situational factors shape moral judgements in the trolley dilemma in Eastern, Southern and Western countries in a culturally diverse sample. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *6*, 880–895. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01319-5

Baker, M. (2022). Digital badges motivate scientists to share data. *Nature*. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2016.19907

Balcazar, F. E., Taylor, R. R., Kielhofner, G. W., Tamley, K., Benziger, T., Carlin, N., & Johnson, S. (2004). Participatory action research: General principles and a study with a chronic health condition. In L. A. Jason, C. B. Keys, Y. Suarez-Balcazar, R. R. Taylor, & M. I. Davis (Eds.), *Participatory community research: Theories and methods in action* (pp. 17–35). American Psychological Association.

Bastian, H. (2017). *Bias in open science advocacy: The case of article badges for data sharing*. Absolutely Maybe. Retrieved from https://absolutelymaybe.plos.org/2017/08/29/bias-in-open-science-advocacy-the-case-of-article-badges-for-data-sharing/

Baum, M., Hart, A., Elsherif, M., Ilchovska, Z. G., Moreau, D., Dokovova, M., LaPlume, A. A., Krautter, K., & Staal, J. (2022). *Research without borders: How to identify and overcome potential pitfalls in international large-team online research projects*. SAGE Research Methods Cases. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529602074

Begeny, J. C., Levy, R. A., Hida, R., Norwalk, K., Field, S., Suzuki, H., Soriano-Ferrer, M., Scheunemann, A., Guerrant, M., Clinton, A., & Burneo, C. A. (2018). Geographically representative scholarship and internationalization in school and educational psychology: A bibliometric analysis of eight journals from 2002–2016. *Journal of School Psychology*, *70*, 44–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.07.001

Bergmann, C. (2023). The buffet approach to open science. *CogTales*. https://cogtales.wordpress.com/author/chbergma/

Berry, J. W. (2013). Global psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *43*(4), 391–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246313504517

Blasi, D. E., Henrich, J., Adamou, E., Kemmerer, D., & Majid, A. (2022). Over-reliance on English hinders cognitive science. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *26*(11), 1153–1170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2022.09.015

Blohowiak, B. B., Cohoon, J., de-Wit, L., Eich, E., Farach, F. J., Hasselman, F., Holcombe, A. O., Humphreys, M., Lewis, M., Nosek, B. A., Peirce, J., Spies, J. R., Seto, C., Bowman, S., Green, D., Nilsonne, G., Grahe, J., Wykstra, S., Mohr, A. H., & Call, M. (2013). Badges to acknowledge open practices. Osf.io Retrieved from https://osf.io/tvyxz/

Boston College Office of Global Engagement Summer visiting doctoral research fellowship. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.bc.edu/content/bc-web/sites/global-engagement/expand-your-world/global-summer-doc-fellowship.html

Buchanan, N. T., Perez, M., Prinstein, M. J., & Thurston, I. (2021). Diversity Accountability Index for Journals (DAI-J): Increasing awareness and establishing accountability across psychology journals. *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/zp9em

Castro Torres, A. F., & Alburez-Gutierrez, D. (2022). North and South: Naming practices and the hidden dimension of global disparities in knowledge production. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(10), e2119373119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2119373119

Chakravartty, P., Kuo, R., Grubbs, V., & McIlwain, C. (2018). #CommunicationSoWhite. *Journal of Communication*, *68*(2), 254–266. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy003

Chambers, C. D., & Tzavella, L. (2021). The past, present and future of registered reports. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *6*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01193-7

Chen, S., Buchanan, E. M., Kekecs, Z., Miller, J. K., Szabelska, A., Aczel, B., Bernabeu, P., Forscher, P., Szuts, A., Vally, Z., Al-Hoorie, A. H., Helmy, M., da Silva, C. S. A., da Silva, L. O., de Moraes, Y. L., Hsu, R. M. C. S., Mafra, A. L., Dixson, B., Peters, K., … Zickfeld, J. (2023). Investigating object orientation effects across 18 languages. *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/2qf6w

Conry-Murray, C., & Silverstein, P. (2022). The role of values in psychological science: Examining identity-based inclusivity. *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/cskg2

Coretta, S., Casillas, J. V., Roessig, S., Franke, M., Al-Hoorie, A. H., Al-Tamimi, J., Alotaibi, N. E., AlShakhori, M. K., Altmiller, R. M., Arantes, P., Athanasopoulou, A., Baese-Berk, M. M., Bailey, G., Sangma, C. B. A., Beier, E. J., Benavides, G. M., Benker, N., BensonMeyer, E. P., Benway, N. R., & Roettger, T. B. (2022). Multidimensional signals and analytic flexibility: Estimating degrees of freedom in human speech analyses. *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/q8t2k

Delios, A., Clemente, E., Wu, T., Tan, H., Wang, Y., Gordon, M., Viganola, D., Chen, Z., Dreber, A., Johannesson, M., Pfeiffer, T., Uhlmann, E. L., Abd Al-Aziz, A. M., Abraham, A. T., Trojan, J., Adamkovic, M., Agadullina, E., Ahn, J., Akinci, C., & Zultan, R. (2022). Examining the context sensitivity of research findings from archival data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(30), e2120377119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2120377119

Draguns, J. G. (2001). Toward a truly international psychology: Beyond English only. *American Psychologist*, *56*(11), 1019–1030. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.56.11.1019

Elsherif, M. M., Middleton, S. L., Phan, J. M., Azevedo, F., Iley, B. J., Grose-Hodge, M., Tyler, S., Kapp, S. K., Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, A., Grafton-Clarke, D., Yeung, S. K., Shaw, J. J., Hartmann, H., & Dokovova, M. (2022). Bridging neurodiversity and open scholarship: How shared values can guide best practices for research integrity, social justice, and principled education. *MetaArxiv*. https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/k7a9p

Ergin, M., & Alkan, A. (2019). Academic neo-colonialism in writing practices: Geographic markers in three journals from Japan, Turkey and the US. *Geoforum*, *104*, 259–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.05.008

Gallo, S. A., Schmaling, K. B., Thompson, L. A., & Glisson, S. R. (2021). Grant review feedback: Appropriateness and usefulness. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *27*(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-021-00295-9

Gervais, W. M. (2021). Practical methodological reform needs good theory. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *16*(4), 827–843. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620977471

Ghai, S. (2021). It's time to reimagine sample diversity and retire the WEIRD dichotomy. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *5*(8), 971–972. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01175-9

Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, A., Kalandadze, T., Yeung, S., Azevedo, F., Iley, B. J., Phan, J. M., Ramuji, A. V., Shaw, J. J., Zaneva, M., Dokovova, M., Hartmann, H., Kapp, S. K., Warrington, K., FORRT., & Elsherif, M. M. (2023). Opening up understanding

of neurodiversity: A call for applying participatory and open scholarship practices. *MetaArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/jq23s

Grosz, M. P., Rohrer, J. M., & Thoemmes, F. (2020). The taboo against explicit causal inference in nonexperimental psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(5), 1243–1255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620921521

Hajdu, N., Schmidt, K., Acs, G., Röer, J. P., Mirisola, A., Giammusso, I., Arriaga, P., Ribeiro, R., Dubrov, D., Grigoryev, D., Arinze, N. C., Voracek, M., Stieger, S., Adamkovic, M., Elsherif, M., Kern, B. M. J., Barzykowski, K., Ilczuk, E., Martoncik, M, … Aczel, B. (2022). Contextual factors predicting compliance behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic: A machine learning analysis on survey data from 16 countries. *PLoS One*, *17*(11), e0276970. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0276970

Harnad, S., & Brody, T. (2004). Comparing the impact of open access (OA) versus non-OA articles in the same journals. *D-lib Magazine*, *10*(6). Retrieved from https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/260207/

Harris, M., Marti, J., Watt, H., Bhatti, Y., Macinko, J., & Darzi, A. W. (2017). Explicit bias toward high-income-country research: A randomized, blinded, crossover experiment of English clinicians. *Health Affairs*, *36*(11), 1997–2004. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0773

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Beyond WEIRD: Towards a broad-based behavioral science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*(2-3), 111–135. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X10000725

Jamieson, M. K., Pownall, M., & Govaart, G. H. (2022). Reflexivity in quantitative research: A rationale and beginner's guide. *PsyArxiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xvrhm

Kathawalla, U. K., Silverstein, P., & Syed, M. (2021). Easing into open science: A guide for graduate students and their advisors. *Collabra: Psychology*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.18684

Kidwell, M. C., Lazarevic´, L. B., Baranski, E., Hardwicke, T. E., Piechowski, S., Falkenberg, L. S., Kennett, C., Slowik, A., Sonnleitner, C., Hess-Holden, C., Errington, T. M., Fiedler, S., & Nosek, B. A. (2016). Badges to acknowledge open practices: A simple, low-cost, effective method for increasing transparency. *PLoS Biology*, *14*(5), e1002456. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002456

Kingi, H., Stanchi, F., Vilhuber, L., & Herbert, S. (2018). *The reproducibility of economics research: A case study*. Presentation. https://osf.io/srg57/

Klein, R. A., Vianello, M., Hasselman, F., Adams, B. G., Adams, R. B., Jr., Alper, S., Aveyard, M., Axt, J. R., Babalola, M. T., Bahník, S., Batra, R., Berkics, M., Bernstein, M. J., Berry, D. R., Bialobrzeska, O., Binan, E. D., Bocian, K., Brandt, M. J., Busching, R., & Nosek, B. A. (2018). Many Labs 2: Investigating variation in replicability across samples and settings. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *1*(4), 443–490. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918810225

Kottai, S. R. (2022). LGBTQIA+ rights, mental health systems, and curative violence in India. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, *VII*(2), 127–133. https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2021.090

Kousha, K., & Abdoli, M. (2010). The citation impact of open access agricultural research: A comparison between oa and non-OA publications. *Online Information Review*, *34*(5), 772–785. https://doi.org/10.1108/14684521011084618

Kozlowski, D., Larivière, V., Sugimoto, C. R., & Monroe-White, T. (2022). Intersectional inequalities in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(2), e2113067119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2113067119

Kurzban, R. (2013). *Is evolutionary psychology WEIRD or NORMAL?* Evolutionary Psychology Blog Archive. Retrieved from https://web.sas.upenn.edu/kurzbanepblog/2013/09/25/is-evolutionary-psychology-weird-or-normal

Manalili, M. R., Pearson, A., Sulik, J., Creechan, L., Elsherif, M. M., Murkumbi, I., Azevedo, F., Bonnen, K. L., Kim, J. S., Kording, K., Lee, J. L., ObscuraKapp, S. K., Roer, J. P., & Morstead, T. (2022). From puzzle to progress: How engaging with neurodiversity can improve. *Cognitive Science*, *47*(2). https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/gns3b

Measey, J. (2017). A "native English speaker" is not what you need. *MeaseyLab Blog*. http://john.measey.com/Blog/2017/12/05/A-native-English-speaker-is-not-what-you-need

Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., & Saenz, M. (2019). *State higher education funding cuts have pushed costs to students, worsened inequality*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Retrieved from https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/state-higher-education-funding-cuts-have-pushed-costs-to-students

Moshontz, H., Campbell, L., Ebersole, C. R., Ijzerman, H., Urry, H. L., Forscher, P. S., Grahe, J. E., McCarth, R. J., Musser, E. D., Atfolk, J., Castille, C. M., Evans, R. R., Fiedler, S., Flake, J. K., Forero, D. A., Janssen, S. M. J., Keene, J. R., Protzko, J., Aczel, B., … Silan, M. A. (2018). The psychological science accelerator: Advancing psychology through a distributed collaborative network. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *1*(4), 501–515. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918797607

Nielsen, M., Haun, D., Kärtner, J., & Legare, C. H. (2017). The persistent sampling bias in developmental psychology: A call to action. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *162*(1), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.04.017

NIH. (2017). *Partnership and collaboration resources for global health researchers*. NIH Fogarty International Center. Retrieved from https://www.fic.nih.gov/Grants/Pages/partnerships-collaborations.aspx

Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., Buck, S., Chambers, C. D., Chin, G., Christensen, G., Contestabile, M., Dafoe, A., Eich, E., Freese, J., Glennerster, R., Goroff, D., Green, D. P., Hesse, B., Humphreys, M., & Yarkoni, T. (2015). SCIENTIFIC STANDARDS. Promoting an open research culture. *Science*, *348*(6242), 1422–1425. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374

Nosek, B. A., & Lakens, D. (2014). Registered reports: A method to increase the credibility of published results [editorial]. *Social Psychology*, *45*(3), 137–141. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000192

Onie, S. (2020). Redesign open science for Asia, Africa and Latin America. *Nature*, *587*(7832), 35–37. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-03052-3

Palser, E. R., Lazerwitz, M., & Fotopoulou, A. (2021). Gender and geographical disparity in editorial boards of journals in psychology and neuroscience. *bioRxiv*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.15.431321

Parsons, S., Azevedo, F., Elsherif, M. M., Guay, S., Shahimet, O. N., Govaart, G., Norris, M., O'Mahony, A., Parker, A. J., Todorovic, A., Pennington, C. R., Garcia-Pelegrin, E., Lazić, A., Robertson, O., Middleton, S. L., Valentini, B., McCuaig, J., Baker, B. J., Collins, E., & Aczel, B. (2022). A community-sourced glossary of open scholarship terms. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *6*(1), 312–318. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01269-4

Pe-Than, E. P. P., & Herbsleb, J. D. (2019). Understanding hackathons for science: Collaboration, affordances, and outcomes. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. In N. Taylor, C. Christian-Lamb, M. Martin, & B. Nardi (Eds.), *Information in contemporary society. iConference 2019* (Vol. 11420, pp. 27–37). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15742-5_3

Pollet, T. V., & Saxton, T. K. (2019). How diverse are the samples used in the journals 'evolution and human behavior' and 'evolutionary psychology. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, *5*(3), 357–368. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-019-00192-2

Power, S. A., & Velez, G. (2020). The MOVE framework: Meanings, observations, viewpoints, and experiences in processes of social change. *Review of General Psychology*, *24*(4), 321–334. https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268020915841

Power, S. A., & Velez, G. (2022). Field social psychology. *American Psychologist*, *77*(8), 940–952. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000931

Pownall, M., Azevedo, F., Aldoh, A., Elsherif, M. M., Vasilev, M. R., Pennington, C. R., Robertson, O. M., Vel Tromp, M., Liu, M., Makel, M. C., Tonge, N. A., Moreau, D., Horry, R., Shaw, J. J., Tzavella, L., McGarrigle, R., Talbot, C. V., & Parsons, S. (2021). Embedding open and reproducible science into teaching: A bank of lesson plans and resources. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000307

Pownall, M., Azevedo, F., König, L. M., Slack, H. R., Evans, T. R., Flack, Z., Grinschgl, S., Elsherif, M. M., Gilligan-Lee, K. A., Oliveira, C. M., Gjoneska, B., Kanadadze, T., Button, K. S., Ashcroft-Jones, S., Terry, J., Albayrak-Aydemir, N., Dechterenko, F., Alzahawi, S., Baker, B. J., … Sadhwani, S. (2023). Teaching open and reproducible scholarship: A critical review of the evidence base for current pedagogical methods and their outcomes. *Royal Society Open Science*, *10*(5), 221255. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.221255

Puthillam, A. (2023). Too WEIRD, too fast? Preprints about COVID-19 in the psychological sciences. *Collabra: Psychology*, *9*(1), 74331. https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.74331

Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J., & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of homo sapiens: Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *115*(45), 11401–11405. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721165115

Randall, A. K., & Bryant, L. (2021). How personal relationships is working to elevate international scholarship. *Relationship Research*, *20*(3), 44–45. https://view.publitas.com/iarr/rrn-november2021/page/44-45

Readsura Decolonial Editorial Collective (in random order), Ratele, K., Reddy, G., Adams, G., & Suffla, S. (2022a). Decoloniality as a social issue for psychological study. *Journal of Social Issues*, *78*(1), 7–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12502

Readsura Decolonial Editorial Collective includes (in random order), Adams, G., Ratele, K., Suffla, S., & Reddy, G. (2022b). Psychology as a site for decolonial analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, *78*(2), 255–277. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12524

Romero-Olivares, A. L. (2019). Review with care. *Science*, *366*(6461), 146. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.366.6461.146

Rucker, D. D., Preacher, K. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2011). Mediation analysis in social psychology: Current practices and new recommendations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *5*(6), 359–371. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00355.x

Saab, R., Ayanian, A. H., & Hawi, D. R. (2020). The status of Arabic social psychology: A review of 21st-century research articles. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *11*(7), 917–927. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620925224

Sabik, N. J., Matsick, J. L., McCormick-Huhn, K., & Cole, E. R. (2021). Bringing an intersectional lens to "open" science: An analysis of representation in the reproducibility project. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *45*(4), 475–492. https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843211035678

Science Media Center. (2009). 10 best practice guidelines for reporting science and health stories. Retrieved from https://www.sciencemediacentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/10-best-practice-guidelines-for-science-and-health-reporting.pdf.7560997

Segalo, P., & Fine, M. (2020). Critical inquiry on gendered violence in the Global North and south: A conversation between puleng Segalo and Michelle fine [keynote presentation]. *The Psychology of Global Crises*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?reload=9&v=lR6jVG7W6rE

Sharpe, B. M., Lavner, J. A., Carter, N. T., Lynam, D., & Miller, J. (2021). Technical Comment on Jonason, P. K., and Luoto, S. (2021). The dark side of the rainbow: Homosexuals and bisexuals have higher Dark Triad traits than heterosexuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *181*, 111040. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111270

Silverstein, P., Elman, C., Montoya, A. K., McGillivray, B., Pennington, C. R., Harrison, C. H., … Syed, M. (2023). A guide for social science journal editors on easing into open science. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/hstcx

Simons, D. J., Shoda, Y., & Lindsay, D. S. (2017). Constraints on generality (COG): A proposed addition to all empirical papers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(6), 1123–1128. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708630

Society for Personality and Social Psychology Rates and inclusion. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://spsp.org/events/2023-annual-convention/registration/rates-inclusions

Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science. (2021). SIPS 2021 static program. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vSGIkhtdNoTURaeCkpCWrVS64md_U2cCXNape5nAa1cZOuz1vKGg66wblntTSiH6J-tuS6FXDiu9PFm0/pub

Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science. (2022). SIPS 2024- dates TBD. Retrieved from https://www.improvingpsych.org/SIPS2024/#:~:text=WELCOME%20TO%20SIPS%202024

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Researchers in the Global South Grants program. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.spssi.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=page.viewPage&pageID=2593

Soland, J., Johnson, A., & Talbert, E. (2022). Regression discontinuity designs in a latent variable framework. *Psychological Methods*, *28*(3), 691–704. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000453

Steltenpohl, C. N. (2020). Is science objective? Retrieved from https://cnsyoung.com/is-science-objective/

Steltenpohl, C. N., Montilla Doble, L. J., Basnight-Brown, D. M., Dutra, N. B., Belaus, A., Kung, C. C., Onie, S., Seernani, D., Chen, S., Burin, D. I., & Darda, K. (2021). Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science global engagement task force report. *Collabra: Psychology*, *7*(1), 22968. https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.22968

Sundararajan, L., Hwang, K. K., & Yeh, K. H. (2020). *Global psychology from indigenous perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Terry, J., Ross, R. M., Nagy, T., Salgado, M., Garrido-Vásquez, P., Sarfo, J. O., Cooper, S., Buttner, A. C., Lima, T. J. S., Öztürk, İ., Akay, N., Santos, F. H., Artemenko, C. A., Copping, L., Elsherif, M. M., Milovanović, I., Cribbie, R. A., Drushlak, M. G., Swainston, K., & Field, A. P. (2023). Data from an international multi-centre study of statistics and mathematics anxieties and related variables in University students (the SMARVUS dataset). *Journal of Open Psychology Data*, *11*(8), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.5334/jopd.80

Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2021). The neglected 95% revisited: Is American psychology becoming less American? *American Psychologist*, *76*(1), 116–129. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000622

The Leverhulme Trust *Visiting professorships*. (n.d.). Leverhulme Trust. Retrieved from https://www.leverhulme.ac.uk/visiting-professorships

The Newmark J-School Research Center. (n.d.). Finding experts guide. Retrieved from https://researchguides.journalism.cuny.edu/findingexperts/diverse-experts

The World Bank. (2020). World bank country and lending groups. Retrieved from https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups

Tierney, W., Hardy, J., Ebersole, C. R., Viganola, D., Clemente, E. G., Gordon, M., Hoogeveen, S., Haaf, J., Dreber, A., Johannesson, M., Pfeiffer, T., Huang, J. L., Vaughn, L. A., DeMarree, K., Igou, E. R., Chapman, H., Gantman, A., Vanaman, M., Wylie, J., … McPhetres, J. (2021). A creative destruction approach to replication: Implicit work and sex morality across cultures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *93*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104060

Tierney, W., Hardy, J. H., Ebersole, C. R., Leavitt, K., Viganola, D., Clemente, E. G., Gordon, M., Dreber, A., Johannesson, M., Pfeiffer, T., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2020). Creative destruction in science. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *161*, 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.07.002

UKRI. (2022). Getting funding for international collaboration. UK Research and Innovation. Retrieved from https://www.ukri.org/what-we-offer/international-funding/getting-funding-for-international-collaboration/ 16 July 2022.

Urry, H. (2021). *Call for Proposals: Grants-in-aid to reduce barriers to improving psychological science*. Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science. Retrieved from https://improvingpsych.org/2021/10/28/grants-in-aid/

Uskul, A. K., & Cross, S. E. (2019). The social and cultural psychology of honour: What have we learned from researching honour in Turkey? *European Review of Social Psychology*, *30*(1), 39–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2018.1542903

van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2013). Contributions of internationalization to psychology: Toward a global and inclusive discipline. *American Psychologist*, *68*(8), 761–770. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033762

van Bavel, J. J., Cichocka, A., Capraro, V., Sjåstad, H., Nezlek, J. B., Pavlović, T., Alfano, M., Gelfand, M. J., Azevedo, F., Birtel, M. D., Cislak, A., Lockwood, P. L., Ross, R. M., Abts, K., Agadullina, E., Aruta, J. J. B., Besharati, S. N., Bor, A., Choma, B. L., & Boggio, P. S. (2022). National identity predicts public health support during a global pandemic. *Nature Communications*, *13*(1), 517. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27668-9

Veillard, N. (2017). WEIRD sampling in cross cultural psychology, should it not be less WEIRD and more representative?: The overrepresentation of individuals from Western educated industrialized and democratic countries as sample populations in cross-cultural psychology research. [Master's thesis, Leiden University]. *Student Repository*. https://hdl.handle.net/1887/56361

Wang, X., Liu, C., Mao, W., & Fang, Z. (2015). The open access advantage considering citation, article usage and social media attention. *Scientometrics*, *103*(2), 555–564. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1547-0

Winter, B. (2019). *Statistics for linguists: An introduction using R*. Routledge.

Yarkoni, T. (2022). The generalizability crisis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *45*, e1. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X20001685

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Arathy Puthillam is a graduate student at the Rady School of Management, UC San Diego. Her research interests lie at the intersection of social, moral, and political psychology.

Lysander James Montilla Doble (he/they) is a lecturer and PhD student in social psychology at the University of the Philippines Diliman Department of Psychology. His research interests include metapsychology as well as issues related to research ethics. They are affiliated with the following organizations: Center for Open Science, South East Asian Network for Open Science (SEANOS), and Philippine Researchers for Open Science (PROScience). He is also currently one of the graduate student representatives of the Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science (SIPS) Executive Committee and a member of the Steering Committee of the upcoming Advancing Science in South East Asia (ASISEA) conference in Q4 2021.

Junix Jerald I. Delos Santos is a Ph.D. student at the Ateneo de Manila University and a faculty member of psychology at the University of Baguio. His research interest lies at the nexus of social and political psychology, particularly genders and sexualities, intergroup relations, and social class and inequality.

Mahmoud Medhat Elsherif is a Research Associate at University of Leicester. Their research interests include reading, linguistic prediction, ageing and neurodiversity. They are keenly interested in meta- and open scholarship initiatives.

Crystal N. Steltenpohl is a research and evaluation associate at the Dartmouth Center for Program Design and Evaluation. Her evaluation work focuses primarily on workforce development within healthcare settings to improve health outcomes for vulnerable populations.

David Moreau is an Associate Professor and the Director of the Brain Dynamics Lab at the University of Auckland in New Zealand. His research seeks to refine our understanding of the dynamic properties of brain and behavior using a range of neuroimaging, behavioral, and statistical methods.

Madeleine Pownall is a Lecturer in Psychology (Teaching and Scholarship) at the School of psychology at the University of Leeds. She completed her PhD in 2022 on women's experiences of cognitive changes throughout pregnancy, using stereotype threat and self-objectification paradigms. Areas of expertise include pedagogical research, social psychology, open science, open scholarship, feminist psychology, psychological literacy, and methods.

Priya Silverstein is a postdoctoral researcher at Ashland University, Ohio, USA. They conduct metascientific research on replicability, generalisability, and uptake of open science practices. They are Associate Director of the Journal Editors Discussion Interface – an initiative with aims to increase open science uptake at social science journals.

Shaakya Anand-Vembar is a Ph.D. researcher at Trinity College Dublin, Ireland. She studies shame in adult survivors of child sexual abuse, and is also keenly interested in meta- and open-science initiatives.

Hansika Kapoor is a Research Author at the Department of Psychology, Monk Prayogshala, Mumbai, India. She has been featured in the book *31 Fantastic Adventures in Science: Women Scientists in India*. Her research interests lie in creativity, socio-moral psychology, and behavioral science.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Puthillam, A., Montilla Doble, L. J., Delos Santos, J. J. I., Elsherif, M. M., Steltenpohl, C. N., Moreau, D., Pownall, M., Silverstein, P., Anand-Vembar, S., & Kapoor, H. (2023). Guidelines to improve internationalization in the psychological sciences. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, e12847. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12847